

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

BRUCE PARKER,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 23-cv-11684  
Hon. Matthew F. Leitman

v.

BRANDON LEE, *et al.*,

Defendants

---

**ORDER (1) ADOPTING RECOMMENDED DISPOSITION OF REPORT  
AND RECOMMENDATION (ECF No. 36) AND (2) GRANTING IN PART  
AND DENYING IN PART DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO DISMISS AND  
FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT (ECF No. 26)**

Plaintiff Bruce Parker is a state inmate in the custody of the Michigan Department of Corrections. On July 14, 2023, Parker filed this *pro se* civil-rights action against the Defendants. (*See* Compl., ECF No. 1.) Parker alleges, among other things, that the Defendants retaliated against him for filing grievances and complaints under the Prison Rape Elimination Act, that Defendants were deliberately indifferent to Parker's risk of harm, and that Defendants violated his equal protection rights. (*See id.*)

On October 16, 2023, in a joint motion, Defendants Brandon Lee, Lance Thompson, and Jeremy Keranen moved to dismiss Parker's claims against them and Defendants Keranen, Kory Krueger, and Stephen Young moved for summary

judgment based on Parker's alleged failure to exhaust his claims. (*See* Mot., ECF No. 26.)

On May 15, 2024, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report and Recommendation in which he recommended granting Defendants' motion in part and denying it in part (the "R&R"). (*See* R&R, ECF No. 36.) More specifically, the Magistrate Judge recommended that the Court (1) grant the motion with respect to Parker's claims of retaliation against Defendants Keranen, Young, and Kreuger and his equal protection claim against Defendants Lee, Thompson, and Keranen, and (2) deny the motion with respect to Parker's retaliation claims against Lee and Thompson and his claim against Keranen arising out of Keranen's conduct on May 14, 2023. (*See id.*, PageID.289.) At the conclusion of the R&R, the Magistrate Judge informed the parties that if they wanted to seek review of his recommendation, they needed to file specific objections with the Court within fourteen days. (*See id.*, PageID.289-290.)

No party has filed an objection to the R&R. Nor has any party contacted the Court seeking additional time to file objections. The failure to object to an R&R releases the Court from its duty to independently review the matter. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985). *See also Ivey v. Wilson*, 832 F.2d 950, (6th Cir. 1987) (explaining that where party fails to file "timely objections" to report and recommendation, court may accept that recommendation "without expressing any view on the merits of the magistrate's conclusions"). Likewise, the failure to file

objections to an R&R waives any further right to appeal. *See Howard v. Sec'y of Health and Human Servs.*, 932 F.2d 505 (6th Cir. 1991); *Smith v. Detroit Fed'n of Teachers Local 231*, 829 F.2d 1370, 1373 (6th Cir. 1987).

Accordingly, because no party has filed any objections to the R&R, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that the Magistrate Judge's recommended disposition of Defendants' motion is **ADOPTED**.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Parker's retaliation claims against Defendants Keranen, Young, and Kreuger and his equal protection claims against Defendants Lee, Thompson, and Keranen are **DISMISSED**.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/Matthew F. Leitman  
MATTHEW F. LEITMAN  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated: June 11, 2024

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was served upon the parties and/or counsel of record on June 11, 2024, by electronic means and/or ordinary mail.

s/Holly A. Ryan  
Case Manager  
(313) 234-5126